## INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.133(b), the applicants submit this statement as a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the interview that took place at the USPTO on July 9, 2010 with Examiner Phan, Joseph T.

The applicants state that the points made in the Remarks section of this document are the substantive points that were made during the interview. No other substantive information was discussed.

## REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a *Non-Final Rejection* that issued in this case on April 13, 2010. In that *Action*, all pending claims were rejected as follows:

      (1)  Claims 1, 2, 17, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

      (2)  Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-18, 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,816,878 to Zimmers.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the invention. Support for the amendment can be found at p. 7, ll. 12-21, Figure 4 and elsewhere in the Specification.

### The Office Action Fails to Address All Limitations of Claim 17

The Office failed to address all limitations of claim 17 in the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of that claim. Claim 17 recites the limitation "*wherein the execution task comprises substituting the identification of the recipient with contact information for that recipient.*" The *Non-Final Rejection* does **not** address this limitation.

### 35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection of Claim 1, 2, 17 and 26

Claims 1, 2, 17, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

Claim 1 was rejected for failing to provide proper antecedent basis to the limitation "transmission." In response, claim 1 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for this limitation.

Claim 2 was rejected for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitation "the one or more designated persons." In response the offending limitation has been removed and substituted with "the recipient," which is provided proper antecedent basis in claim 1.

Claim 26 was rejected because the limitation "the event notification system" rendered the claim unclear. In response, the offending limitation has been removed.

Claim 26 was rejected because the limitation "transmission" lacked proper antecedent basis. In response claim 26 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for this limitation.

Claim 17 was rejected on multiple grounds. The Office alleged that the limitations recipient, communication flow, and transmission lacked proper antecedent basis. In response, claim 17 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for all of its limitations.

The Office also takes issue with the use of the limitations "generation task" and "execution task." In response, claim 17 has been amended to avoid the recitation of "generation task."

Furthermore, claim 17 has been amended to recite "execution action" instead of "execution task." The applicants submit that the recitation of execution action complies with 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim 17 recites " a process or operative to generate.... execute..." The use of the infinitives "to generate" and "to execute" invariably leads to the conclusion that in claim 17, "execute" and "generate" are used as verbs. A verb is a content word that denotes action.

Therefore, it would be clear to one skilled in the art that the limitation "*wherein the execution action comprises substituting the identification of the recipient with contact information for the recipient*" is aimed to clarify the manner in which the processor executes communication flow expressions. For this reason, the use of the limitation "execution action" in claim 17, as amended, is both appropriate and in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112.

Because of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 17, and 26 is overcome.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 4-28

Claims 1-2 and 4-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by S. Zimmers.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> **1.** (Currently Amended)  A method comprising:
>
> receiving, at an event notification system, a communication;
>
> generating, at the event notification system, a notification message, wherein the notification message *includes information about a response to the communication, wherein the response is dispatched prior to the generation of the notification message*;
>
> generating, at the event notification system, a communication flow expression which contains at least one instruction *concerning a transmission of the notification message*, wherein the communication flow expression specifies a first recipient for the notification message; and
>
> executing the communication flow expression, at the event notification system, and sending the notification message from the event notification system to the first recipient.
>
> (*emphasis supplied*)

Nowhere does Zimmers teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 1 recites — namely:

> (1)  generating a notification message which includes information about a response that was dispatched, and
>
> (2) generating a communication flow expression which contains an instruction concerning the transmission of the message.

**The First Limitation**

The first limitation of claim 1 which is *not* found in Zimmers is "*wherein the notification message includes information about a response that was dispatched.*"

For example, and without limitation, a user may use the event notification system of claim 1 to report a gas leak in his neighborhood.  The user can report the gas leak by sending a text message to the event notification system.  Upon receiving the message, the system can take two actions.

First, the event notification system will dispatch a response to the message.  (*See* task 315 of Figure 3 "*Dispatch Appropriate Response to Emergency If Necessary*")  In dispatching the response, the notification system will contact emergency personnel, such as the fire department, and inform them about the dangerous situation.

Second, the event notification system can send a notification message to the neighbor of the user who reported the gas leak.  (*See* task 250 of Figure 3 "*Generate Notification Message...*")  The notification message will inform the neighbor of the danger.  And also, the

notification message will indicate that the fire department has been notified. The latter information is an example of "*information about a response that was dispatched for the received communication*" prior to the transmission of the notification message to the neighbor. (*See* paragraph [0025] "*notification message may indicate, the nature of the emergency, the emergency personnel that was dispatched...*")

In the context of this example, the information about the dispatched response is useful because it will give the neighbor an assurance that the authorities have been notified. And also, it will prevent the neighbor from calling the fire department, thereby reducing the possibility of duplicate calls being made about the same emergency.

Zimmers fails to teach the above limitation. Zimmers discloses a system for providing alert notifications. However, Zimmers contains no disclosure of including "*information about a response that was dispatched for [a] received communication*" in the alert notifications which the Zimmers system distributes.

During the telephone interview held on July 9, 2010, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 did not clearly define all features of the present invention. In response, the applicant's have amended claim 1 to explicitly recite that the response is dispatched *prior to the notification message.* It is believed that the addition of this limitation suffices to overcome Zimmers.

**The Second Limitation**

The second limitation of claim 1 that is not found in Zimmers is "*generating...a communication flow expression...*" This limitation is not anticipated by Zimmers.

The Specification discloses in paragraph [0018] that "[c]ommunication flows are characterized by communication flow expressions, success specifications, communication flow rules and parameters." A communication flow identifies the specific designees 120 that are to receive the notice, as well as how, when and where each designee 120 shall receive the message in accordance with the specified preferences of each designee 120." (*See* paragraph [0018] of the Specification)

Additionally, the Specification points to Application number 10/184,236 as discussing communication flow expressions in more detail. In particular, the latter application recites "communication flow expressions specify the recipients for a given request, and how, when and where each recipient shall receive the request." (*See* Abstract of Application

10/184,236)  In short, communication flow expressions allow the notification messages to account for recipients' preferences and add flexibility to the functioning of the event notification system.

Zimmers does not disclose the use of communication flow expressions.

During the telephone interview held on July 9, 2010, the Examiner advised the applicants to add further detail about the nature of the communication flow expression.  In response, claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the communication flow expression specifies at least one recipient of the notification message.  It is believed that the addition of this limitation overcomes Zimmers.

For the forgoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Zimmers.

Because 2, 4-16, 27, and 28 depend on claim 1, they are likewise allowable.

Claim 17, in pertinent part, recites:

> **17.** An apparatus comprising:
>
> . . . .
>
> **wherein the execution action comprises substituting the identification of the recipient with contact information for the recipient.**
>
> (*emphasis supplied*)

Nowhere does Zimmers teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 17, recites — namely executing a communication flow expression, wherein the execution comprises *substituting a recipient identification with contact information for that recipient*.  This limitation is **not** addressed in the *Non-Final Rejection*.

Claim 17 is directed to a feature of communication flow expression which is referred to in the specification as dynamic communication flow expression substitution.  The feature allows the "binding of designee names to information in the designee preference database 400 [to be] delayed until the time of contact."  (*See* paragraph [0030])

The dynamic substitution feature allows substitutions of information in communications flow expressions to be delayed until the time has come for the expressions to be executed.  In this way, the present invention ensures that information that the most recent information available is inserted into the communication flow expressions.  For instance, "the late

- 11 -

binding aspect implies that a designee described as a role, such as the CEO company, can change until the system 101 begins its attempt to notify the CEO." (*See* paragraph [0030])

Zimmers, in contrast, mentions nothing about communication flow expressions, let alone an arrangement in which the execution of a communications flow expression comprises substituting the identification of a recipient with contact information for that recipient. In fact, the Office never made a claim that Zimmers teaches this particular limitation.

As a consequence, Zimmers does not anticipate claim 17.

Because 18-25 depend on claim 17, they are likewise allowable over Zimmers.

Like claim 1, claim 26 contains the limitation "*the notification message includes information about a response to the communication*..." So, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 26 is not anticipated by Zimmers.

**Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111**

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Joann J. Ordille et al.

By **/Kiril Dimov/**
Kiril Dimov
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60490
732-578-0103 x215

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America